

## REMARKS

The non-final Office Action mailed April 21, 2005, has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1, 15, 18, 20, 24 and 25 have been amended. Claims 1-18 and 20-29 are pending in the application.

In paragraph three on page two of the Office Action, claims 1-7, 12-18, 20-22 and 24-27 were rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bain et al. in view of Ota Naoki. In paragraph four on page 12 of the Office Action, claim 8 was rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bain and Ota as applied to claims 1 and 7, and in further view of McLaughlin.

Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have amended the claims to more particularly distinguish the invention over the cited references.

Applicant's independent claims require, at least, forwarding or directing to the residual print queue print jobs having a print queue designation that does not match a named print queue in the printing device when the print job is initially received by the printing device. Accordingly, Applicant's invention recognizes and processes print jobs that are directed to nonexistent or otherwise undefined print queues associated with a printing device. The present invention provides for a special residual print queue to which print jobs are directed that do not identify valid, predefined print queue names when the print jobs are initially received by the printing device.

Print jobs that identify valid print queue names are directed to their respective print queues corresponding to the valid print queue names. Thus, all of the print jobs, both those associated with valid print queue names, and those residing in the special residual queue, may be printed. In this manner, print commands for print jobs that do not identify defined print queue names when the print jobs are received will not be rejected or ignored, but rather can be printed by the printing device.

In contrast, Bain et al. disclose that receipt of the print command causes the microprocessor 19 to operate in accordance with the queue job routine depicted in FIG. 3 wherein the job identified by the print command is added to the destination queue specified in the print command. When a print command, identifying a job to be printed,

is received, the microprocessor 19 in accordance with the queue job routine depicted in FIG. 3 determines at a block 80 whether the destination queue designated in the print command exists. If not, the microprocessor at block 82 exits the subroutine.

Thus, according to Bain et al., a print job that identifies, when the print job is received, a destination queue that does not exist is not printed, i.e., the print routine illustrated in Fig. 3 is exited.

Ota fails to overcome the deficiencies of Bain et al. Ota merely discloses restoring print jobs. However, Ota does not address the issue of receiving print jobs that do not identify a valid print queue. Ota merely stores a print job in a history queue to eliminate the necessity to transmit the print job when the user wants to reprint the print job. Ota is not concerned with how to handle print jobs that are received having print queues when the print jobs are received that do not identify valid print queues.

Thus, Ota and Bain et al., alone or in combination, fail to suggest forwarding or directing to the residual print queue print jobs having a print queue designation that does not match a named print queue in the printing device when the print job is initially received by the printing device.

McLaughlin fails to overcome the deficiencies of Bain et al. and Ota. McLaughlin is merely cited as teaching the use of the Line Printer Daemon (LPD) protocol. McLaughlin fails to even mention the problem of print jobs having unrecognized print queue names. Thus, McLaughlin, Bain et al. and Ota alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest all of the limitations of Applicant's application. Thus, Applicant asserts that the § 103(a) rejections are improper and request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2-14, 16-17, 21-23, and 26-29 are also patentable over the references, because they incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claims 1, 15, 18, 20 and 25. Further dependent claims 2-14, 16-17, 21-23, and 26-29 recite additional novel elements and limitations. Applicant reserves the right to argue independently the patentability of these additional novel aspects. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-14, 16-17, 21-23, and 26-29 are

Appl. Serial No. 09/957,866  
TUC920010052US1/(2003901-0517-B-DWL)  
Amdt. Dated January 20, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2005

patentable over the cited references, and request that the objections to the independent claims be withdrawn.

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of this application and its allowance are requested.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Attorney for Applicant, David W. Lynch, at 423-757-0264.

Respectfully submitted,

Chambliss, Bahner and Stophel  
1000 Tallan Building  
Two Union Square  
Chattanooga, TN 37402  
423-757-0264

By: 

Name: David W. Lynch

Reg. No.: 36,204